

1/14/69

McDermid; Oswald's legal rights.

Fritz's story does not hold water. For example, if he had given Oswald that message, it would still have existed at the time Oswald was shot. OD 495, "14 FBI photographs of phone numbers found in pocket of Oswald at time of shooting", says there were two scraps of paper. I assume when he was jailed and everything taken away from him except for what would have to be very unusual. Each of this papers, according to that report (which I did not copy, having examined it when I was not able to buy Xeroxes), was torn in the same pattern. The numbers are AL2-4611; CO7-3110, one one scrap, and on the other, OR2-9450 and RI8-9711. In the case of the third number, the way I typed it is "OR("". The logical type is the ( for the 9, being the same key.

None of these seem to be on the enclosed Jim list. The RI8 seems like a Dallas number. In fact, though I've been there but once, it seems familiar. No time now to check. I'd mislaid this note, found it only this a.m. in a stack of stuff waiting more than a ~~1/2~~ year and a half for filing.

Fritz did not say the telegram was given Oswald or put with his papers, he things that should have been done. If this were not, then the police should have filed and kept it. Or gotten a duplicate from local Western Union,

If Western Union could not provide a copy of the telegram, I think the most likely explanation is that the FBI got it, which would also explain ~~missed~~ Fritz's answer. The FBI is careful not to say it asked Western Union, and the company does have a record of delivery. The FBI does not say who got the wire.

Missing is page 377. Is it on something else yet between 375 and 378?

Without the denial of Oswald's rights, none of what subsequently happened could have. Without shenanigans, he would not have been denied his rights. The police knew Abt had said no and they didn't tell Oswald. They knew he wanted ACLU and three officials told ~~the~~ otherwise. McDermid, in Chicago, seems to have known. The NBC footage includes his ACLU speech. This is in WHITERASH. Therefore, I regard the denial of his rights, the lying to him and the ACLU and the Commission, etc., misrepresentation, as not just the normal police abuse of the individual.